# Minutes of the Committee of Practitioners Meeting MacKay Building, Pierre SD May 3, 2017

#### Call to Order

The meeting of the ESEA Committee of Practitioners (COP) was called to order by Becky Guffin, chair, at 10:03 a.m. at the MacKay Building, Pierre, SD on May 3, 2017.

#### Attendance

Members present were: Becky Guffin, Kari Behm, Joan Pribyl, Becky Eeten, Kate Mellor, Laura Willemssen, and Cecilia Estes. Chrissy Peterson and Lori Bouza were able to attend the meeting via the phone.

Staff persons in attendance for all or part of the meeting were: Shannon Malone, Laura Scheibe, Kathy Riedy, Becky Nelson, Sue Burgard, Jill Cotton, Jordan Dueis, Betsy Chapman, Yutzil Becker, and Laura Johnson Frame.

### Approval of the Agenda

Motion by Peterson, second by Eeten to approve the agenda as printed. Motion passed and the agenda was approved.

# Approval of the Minutes of November 21, 2016

Motion by Bouza, second by Pribyl to approve the minutes of the November 21, 2016 meeting. The motion passed.

### **Public Comment**

No member of the public attended the meeting and no comments were received.

### **New Member**

Members were introduced to Cecilia Estes, newly appointed member of the committee. Ms. Estes is a teacher of students who are studying English as a second language (EL). She is currently providing all types of EL services for students at the Belle Fourche and Spearfish school districts.

# **Members with Terms Ending**

Members whose terms will end during 2017 will be contacted to determine whether or not each wants to be re-appointed to another term.

## **Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson**

June is considered the annual meeting of the Committee of Practitioners per the committee guidelines. As there won't be a June meeting, the election should be held during this meeting. The positions of chairperson and vice chairperson are to be elected annually at the annual meeting and serve a one year term.

Guffin asked for nominations for the position of chairperson.

Motion by Bouza to nominate Becky Guffin as chairperson. Peterson made a motion to second the nomination, that nominations cease, and the committee cast a unanimous ballot for Guffin. Motion passed and Guffin was elected.

Guffin asked for nominations for the position of vice chairperson.

Motion by Bouza to nominate Laura Willemssen as vice chairperson. Pribyl, made a motion to second the nomination, that nominations cease, and the committee cast a unanimous ballot for Willemssen. Motion passed and Willemssen was elected.

### **Review of the Draft ESSA State Plan**

With the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) through the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA), each state must create and submit to the US Department of Education a new state plan that meets the requirements of the ESSA. The SD Department of Education (SD DOE) has been working on the South Dakota state plan for the past thirteen months through the work of six work groups and more than fifty presentations to all types of groups and organizations to gather input.

The draft plan will be reviewed by the COP during this meeting. The draft will appear on the SD DOE website starting in May with a presentation to the SD Board of Education of a plan summary on May 15. An official comment period of 30 days as required in the statute will run from May into June. On June 17, the SD Board of Education will hold a public hearing on the draft state plan. In late July, the draft plan will be presented to the Governor. The plan must be submitted to the US Department of Education by the deadline of September 18.

### **Accountability and Academic Growth**

Laura Scheibe, SD DOE Office of Accreditation and Accountability, began the presentation of the state plan by explaining the process followed while building the plan and gathering public comment. Scheibe indicated that some of the components of the state plan will not be submitted in final form as certain areas are still "under construction" and other areas require gathering more data from our own data systems to help us set direction. Upon reviewing other state plans already submitted, SD DOE has found that this is not uncommon for the states to continue working on a plan that has been submitted.

When posted, the draft state plan will be found at http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx.

Scheibe reviewed the following sections of the state plan:

Accountability – Four Year Cohort Rate and High School Completer Rate and SD DOE high school equivalency test

Accountability - College and Career Ready

Accountability School Quality – chronic absenteeism or other school quality measure to be used in future years (after two years). The draft plan will use the rate of 90% attendance rate to match other areas of the statute rather than the previously proposed 95%.

**English Learners Proficiency** 

Academic Growth and School Performance Index (SPI) Points

Accountability – Comprehensive and Targeted Support calculation (moving from school improvement language to "school support" language)

Accountability – Exit Criteria from Comprehensive and Targeted Support

Questions from the COP members consisted of:

What is the importance of attendance when a student is doing well? Academic growth may reveal how students are doing over time as some schools with lowest overall achievement have shown the greatest academic growth; with the opposite also true, schools with the highest achievement may not be reflecting must academic growth.

Who will determine the tests to measure high school equivalency as home schoolers may take any test and the tests are not monitored for actually measuring equivalency? The state will determine the tests that

measure equivalency based on the tests alignment to the state standards. Questions were asked about the subgroups. Special education students will benefit from the Career and Technical Education credits in the college and career accountability indicator. The definition will need to be updated.

### **School Improvement Support**

Jordan Dueis, SD DOE program representative, explained the School Improvement Supports and Exit Criteria to the committee. Exit Criteria for a comprehensive school consists of the school continuing in the status a) four years, b) no longer meeting the definition, c) performance on accountability indicators demonstrates positive trajectory, and d) improvement on the indicator of highest need. Exit Criteria for targeted support consists of the school continuing in the status for a) two or more years, b) no longer meeting the definition, c) performance of the group triggering identification is overall positive, d) performance of gap group on all indicators has not declined and, e) improvement on indicator of highest need.

The supports provided to a comprehensive school are a) needs assessment during planning year with school support team member assistance, b) creation of school improvement plans, c) conducting annual data digs, d) SD DOE supports provided, and e) 1003(a) funds. The supports provided to targeted schools are a) LEA support, b) creation of school improvement plans, c) SD DOE supports, and d) 1003(a) funds depending on availability and number of schools in the district designated.

### Title I 1003(a) Funds

Shannon Malone explained how 1003(a) funds are generated. Previously each state could set aside 4% of regular Title I funds calculated from a formula portion of increased LEA funding reserved for school support. ESSA allows for 7% of this portion of the funding to be used for school support. Malone advised the committee that the Department will receive approximately \$3,000,000 in 1003(a) School Support funding for the next fiscal year. SD DOE is requesting to set aside \$1,000,000 of this for state level school support activities. The remaining funds will be used as grants to the schools needing support. Activities include Statewide System of Support and direct support from the Department and the need for additional funds to support the School Support Team. The Department asked the COP members whether 7% from the top for the state level administration as allowed by the statute was a reasonable amount to set aside for this purpose.

Motion by Pribyl, second by Estes to hold \$1,000,000 of the 1003(a) School Support funds for use by the Department in providing support to the schools needing improvement. Motion passed.

# Title IV Part B -21st Century After-School Programs

Sue Burgard, program representative with the 21<sup>st</sup> Century program, described to the committee how a group of representatives from around the state met in Pierre on January 26 and provided their thoughts about changes to the program under ESSA. They provided ideas on how to prepare for a new granting process and implementation of changes pertaining to partnering groups. Changes in the ESSA also provides for extending grants to additional schools under the expanded definition of schoolwide schools under Title I. Please review the draft state plan. For additional information on recommendations from the work group visit <a href="http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx">http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx</a>

# Title IV Part A – School Support and Academic Enrichments

Malone provided information about this program. A stakeholder group met on January 25 to provide input into how to implement this new program under the law. The SD DOE is waiting to hear whether this program will be funded. As the funding to this program can be transferred to other Titles, the SD DOE is having difficulty in determining when the grants management system can be opened without the needed funding information. We estimate there could be \$400 million available with the largest grants going to the four LEAs. Other districts would get small allotments of approximately \$10,000. Please

review the draft state plan for this Title. For additional information on recommendations from the work group visit http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx

Lunch: The committee had a short break until 12:11 p.m.

## Title II, Part A – Supporting Effective Instruction

Becky Nelson and Kathy Riedy from the Division of Learning and Instruction spoke to the committee. At the time of the meeting, it was unclear whether this Title would be funded as those advocating for not funding the program pointed toward lack of data to show success. This is a program that helps to improve the overall education of students and by its very design makes it difficult to separate out whether this specific program, standing alone, improved academic performance. The purpose of the funds are to provide professional development for principals; support implementation of high quality standards and instruction; assist schools in using data to inform instruction; maintain equity among schools; and address cultural needs of students.

### **LEA (District) Plans and Schoolwide Programs**

Betsy Chapman, Title I program representative, gave a presentation on the changes to the grants management system. The SD DOE expects to open the grants management system late this year as budget projections are expected to come in late. Chapman also led the group in a discussion about the LEA Plans/District Plans required under ESSA; though the plans are not new, the requirements have changed to thirteen components that need to be addressed. Also, the requirements for schoolwide plans have changed. Each schoolwide school will need to create a new plan using a template developed by SD DOE. Both the LEA plan and the schoolwide plans will need to be created and uploaded into the grants management system this summer as ESSA requires plans to be in place prior to distribution of funds. Plans will need to be adjusted as needed and with input from stakeholders. The plans will need to be uploaded into GMS yearly. Chapman reminded the members that all documents in the grants management system are available to the public on the SD DOE website; the only information masked is the number of students.

### **English Language Proficiency**

Yutzil Becker, Title III program representative, provided information about the English Language work group that met over the past year. The state plan will include the following provisions: A recently arrived EL student may be excluded from one administration of reading or language arts assessments but must participate in math or science. The math or science score is not included in the accountability determination only in the participation calculation. Former English learners may be included for two years after exiting the program when calculating student achievement and academic growth. In order for an EL student to exit the EL program he/she must achieve an overall composite score of 5.0 on ACCESS 2.0 assessment. Scheibe provided information on the long term goals for English Language Proficiency and an individual student's target trajectory over four years. The "n" size will be calculated using three years of data and may include the same student more than once. Please review the draft state plan. http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx

A question was asked about the "n" size of 10 for this subgroup. In a small district one family with four children over a three year period could easily account for the entire subgroup. This seems personally identifiable and frustrating to a district to have one family move a school into school support status. The response is that many states use the "n" size of 10 or even of 5. Because of the nature of our state, a larger "n" size makes our districts less accountable.

## **Private School – Title Funding and Consultation**

Jordan Dueis, program representative, described the changes in the ESSA statute pertaining to notification of private schools of their equitable share of Title funding and consultation with the public school district. Dueis has been providing webinars for school districts and private school representatives. ESSA requires each state to designate an ombudsman; Dueis is designated as South Dakota's. Please review the draft state planhttp://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx

## Tribal Consultation – Title VIII General Provisions, Section 8538

Dueis reported that under ESSA each school district that has a student population of at least 50% American Indian or that receives an ESSA Title VI Part A Subpart 1 Indian Education grant in the previous year that exceeded \$40,000 must consult with the tribes that are located in the district. In South Dakota at least 20 school districts received these grants that exceeded \$40,000. A consultation form will be required and will most likely be uploaded each year into the grants management system when applying for federal funds. SD DOE is working with the nine tribes to establish protocol for consultation to ensure that the tribes are consulted about the education their children will receive in the public schools and about the use of federal funds prior to the application process for those funds. Under ESSA, the tribes must elect or appoint persons to specifically be involved in the consultations. For more information on tribal consultation please go to <a href="http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx">http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx</a>

Several questions were asked by the members about the definition of consultation and how to determine the tribes. Several districts have students from multiple tribes and are concerned about the coordination and time involved in consulting with all of those tribes. Is a letter to the tribe or a public notice in the newspaper for comments considered consultation? Could this consultation be the same as is conducted for the required consultation under the Johnson-O'Malley Act? Could the SD DOE specify a number of students attending the LEA before a consultation is required? What about the high numbers of students who move from the reservation to a public district and then back again, will these students be part of the count/consultation?

### Title I Part C – Migrant

Malone reported on the Migrant Program. We anticipate a drop in funding this year. The draft state plan reiterates the goals of the South Dakota Migrant Program that are to increase graduation rates, ensure kindergarten readiness, build the basics of language and math skills, and ensuring that English learners are getting the additional assistance needed. Please view the plan at <a href="http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx">http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx</a>

### Title I Part D – Delinquent

Laura Johnson Frame, state coordinator, told the committee that this program had been monitored by the US Department of Education the end of April with follow-up information provided since. We are waiting to hear the recommendations from the Department. The state plan for this Title is found on page 50 of the larger plan. The emphasis of the program is on transition and better data collection to show that students are returning to regular schools and preparing for college and the work force. Johnson Frame asked for comments particularly from the LEAs with programs. To view the plan, go to <a href="http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx">http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx</a>

#### Title IX Part A – McKinney-Vento Education of Homeless Children and Youth (M-V)

Johnson Frame, state coordinator, advised the committee that emphasis within the M-V Program is in a few areas.

- Districts are required to designate a liaison and the liaison must receive training and must provide training to other staff in the LEA.
- Better dispute resolution procedures must be created at the LEA and SEA level.
- Preschool is now included as a school of origin.

- Equal access to full participation in academic and full and partial credit accrual must be allowed and remove all barriers.
- Full participation in extra-curricular activities must be allowed and enabled remove all barriers such as fees, fines, transportation costs.
- Students must be provided more advice from counselors and assistance in preparation for college and the work force.

For more information, please review the plan at <a href="http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx">http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/essa.aspx</a>

After review of all of the above sections of the draft South Dakota State Plan, the committee members voiced that they had no further questions or comments. Guffin and the SD DOE staff thanked the members for all of their time and consideration of the plan. The draft plan will now go to the South Dakota Board of Education for their first view.

### **Next Meeting**

The committee decided to meet in person on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, in Pierre at the MacKay Building.

### Adjournment

By consensus, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m.